

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) 2:04-cr-0441-GEB  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
) ORDER  
v. )  
)  
WILLIAM BLOOMFIELD, )  
)  
Defendant. )  
\_\_\_\_\_  
)

On December 19, 2005, the Clerk's Office filed a letter that Defendant Bloomfield addressed to me, in which Defendant states in part that he "no longer trust [sic] [his] attorney to pass on" certain information. Defendant's attorney is directed to inform Defendant that he is to discontinue writing me letters. If Defendant desires to communicate with me, he is to communicate through his attorney. See United States v. Olana, 62 F.3d 1180, 1193 (9th Cir. 1995) (stating that a defendant does not have the constitutional right to be co-counsel alongside his attorney); United States v. Halbert, 640 F.2d 1000, 1009 (9th Cir. 1981) (same).

Since Defendant's letter communication is unauthorized, I decline to acknowledge it. United States v. Bergman, 813 F.2d 1027,

1 1030 (9th Cir. 1987) (holding that the district court need not  
2 acknowledge pro se filings by a criminal defendant who is  
3 represented by counsel).

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: December 21, 2005

6 /s/ Garland E. Burrell, Jr.  
7 GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.  
8 United States District Judge

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28